

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action dated October 5, 2004, has been reviewed. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 19, 23, 24, 27-29, and 35-58 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-18, 20, 21, 22, 25-26 and 30-34 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 35-58 are new claims.

Regarding the Section 112 Rejection

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 has been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the section 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the Section 102 Rejection.

Claims 19-23 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Moseley (US Pat. No. 5,193,114). Although applicant would agree with the Examiner that Moseley discloses in Figure 2, an Owner's Home Reader (OHR) that incorporates a printer, applicant respectfully points out that Moseley does not teach or anticipate "a printer cartridge comprising a roaming security device having one or more device secrets and a means for generating a random number."

Claim 19, as amended, claims, among other things, "a printer cartridge comprising a roaming security device having one or more device secrets and a means for generating a random number." As such, applicant respectfully submits that Moseley does not teach or anticipate

amended claim 19. Applicant requests that the section 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claim 19 is ready for allowance.

Claims 20-22 have been canceled without prejudice thereby rendering the section 102 rejection of these claims moot.

Claim 23, as amended, is dependant on claim 19 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 19. Furthermore, claim 23 recites that “the printer cartridge is disabled responsive to the roaming security device being removed from the printer cartridge.” Applicant submits that since Moseley does not disclose a printer cartridge that comprises a security device, then Moseley cannot anticipate the removal of a security device from a printer cartridge. As such applicant further submits that Moseley does not teach, allude to, or anticipate claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests that the section 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claim 23 is ready for allowance.

Regarding the Section 103 Rejection.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 17, 18, 24, 27-29, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) for being rendered obvious by Moseley (US Pat. 5,193,114) in view of Pieterse et al (US Pat. 5,907,832).

Applicant respectfully points out that Moseley, as discussed above, does not teach, allude to, or render obvious “a printer cartridge comprising a roaming device.” Applicant further notes that Pieterse does not remedy the inadequacies of Moseley. Also applicant notes that neither reference teaches, alludes to, or renders obvious “allowing a host printer device to print documents if said printer cartridge comprising the roaming security device is authenticated.” In fact, all the cited references are quiet with respect to authenticating a printer cartridge.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, 17, 18, and 34 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the section 103 rejection of these claims is moot.

Independent claim 24, as amended, recites among other things, "receiving, at a printer cartridge comprising a roaming device, a challenge from a host printer device." Furthermore, claim 24 recites, "allowing said host printer device to print documents if said printer cartridge comprising said roaming device is authenticated." Since the cited references do not teach, allude to, or render obvious these recited elements, applicant respectfully requests that the section 103 rejection should be withdrawn and submits that independent claim 24 is ready for allowance.

With respect to claims 27-29, these claims are each directly dependant upon claim 24 and are not rendered obvious for, at least, the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 24. Applicant requests that the section 103 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claims 27-29 are ready for allowance.

Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) for being rendered obvious by Moseley, in view of Pieterse, and further in view of Schneier. Applicant canceled claims 10-12 without prejudice and submits that this rejection is now moot.

Regarding the New Claims.

New claims 35 through 58 have been added to claim additional aspects of the invention that the inventor believes to be patentable. All new claims are firmly supported in the originally filed application.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue

Dated: JAN 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Greenfield

Registration No.: 38,166

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

(214) 855-4300 (Fax)